

REMARKS

In the May 18, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-11 were pending in the application and were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,182,072 to Leak et al. (Reference A in the August 26, 2004 Office Action) in view of U.S. Patents 6,886,178 to Mao et al. (Reference A in the June 2, 2005 and November 29, 2005 Office Actions) and 5,974,445 to Pivnichny et al. (Reference A in the May 18, 2006 Office Action). Claims 1-11 remain in the case. The rejections are traversed below.

In the May 18, 2006 Office Action, it was acknowledged that the combination of Leak et al. and Mao et al. "fails to explicitly disclose that the instruction information covering selection operations for all the selection items to check whether the plurality of pages are output corresponding to the selection operations" (page 4, lines 3-5). It was asserted that the newly-cited Pivnichny et al. "teaches the use of an instruction information covering selection operations for all the selection items to check whether the plurality of pages are output corresponding to the selection operation" (Office Action, page 4, lines 6-8) at column 2, lines 26-29 and 39-58 and column 5, line 21 et seq.

Applicants contend that an objective of Pivnichny et al. is indicating, on a web-browser page, availability of respective web pages at destinations of all the links contained in the currently displayed web page. The system conducts an availability check respectively for all linked destinations of web pages one after another and displays results of the availability check. It is implied that an availability check is performed by attempting to link to the destination web pages. As a result of the operations performed by a system according to Pivnichny et al., an operator can recognize availability of web pages at destinations of all the links contained in a displayed page automatically by merely having the contents of the page displayed on a screen.

In comparison, the present invention is directed to a data broadcast program browser which displays all the pages automatically so that a broadcasting business operator can monitor and confirm absence of any flaw in data broadcast content. This is accomplished by caching all pages of the data broadcast content in advance. Data that represents a selection order list (like that illustrated in Fig. 8 and described at page 14, lines 10-20) is also prepared in advance. The "selection order list" (e.g., claim 1, line 11) is used to automatically select operations for all of the items to be checked.

It is submitted that the term "selection order list" must be interpreted in light of the specification since it is not a term of art and it is clear from the specification that the selection order list is significantly different from a conventional web page. As described in the application,

the selection order list is formatted to appear to be identical to a "remote control operational procedure" (page 14, lines 14-15) and preferably is formatted "in a table format or another format" (page 14, lines 19-20) that can be easily check to confirm that everything is listed properly.

As discussed above, Pivnichny et al. is significantly different from the present invention in that it only discloses checking sites corresponding to hot links contained in one currently displayed page. In practice, it is common to find that one link leads to another set of linked pages and it becomes impossible to check all of the links on all of the linked pages, unless checking is arbitrarily stopped at a predefined depth, such as the first link. In comparison, the claims recite "outputting the content information to a broadcasting business operator ... so that the content information output can be checked by the broadcasting business operator" (e.g., claim 1, last four lines), where what is being checked "includes content information of data broadcasting" (e.g., claim 1, lines 5-6). As a result, the present invention is used in a situation where the content to be checked is defined and can have multiple levels, unlike the system taught by Pivnichny et al. which either only goes to one level of links or a potentially endless series of links.

The fundamental difference between the invention and the combination of references used to reject the claims is also apparent when comparing the invention with the primary reference, Leak et al. On page 3, lines 10-13 of the Office Action, it was explained that the client (presumably "WebTV client" in Fig. 1 of Leak et al.) "is interpreted to be the 'broadcasting business operator', where the content information can be 'checked' or viewed by the client or 'broadcasting business operation' on the display screen." Similar statements appear at page 10, lines 16-17; page 12, lines 17-19; and page 15, lines 8-10. However, a "WebTV client" in Fig. 1 of Leak et al. is conventionally used by a consumer, and nothing has been cited in any of the references to suggest that such a client could or would be used by a "broadcasting business operator" to check "content information of data broadcasting" (e.g., claim 1, lines 5-6). The difference is not merely one of semantics or labeling. A broadcasting business operator is in the position to meaningfully check "the content information output" (e.g., claim 1, last 2 lines), while all that a conventional Web TV client user can do is check whether content information is output. There is no checking of the output itself.

An additional difference between the "checking availability of hotlinks" (Pivnichny et al., column 2, lines 39-40) and generating "instruction information for automatically selecting a plurality of selection items, ... including a selection order list which covers selection operations

for all the selection items to check whether the plurality of pages are output corresponding to the selection operations" (e.g., claim 8, lines 8-13) is that "the plurality of pages" is included in "content information of data broadcasting" (e.g., claim 8, lines 6-7) that is in "a section signal" that is selected "from the baseband signal" as recited on lines 4-5 of claim 8, for example.

For the above reasons, it is submitted that claims 1-11 patentably distinguish over the applied art.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-11 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9/18/06

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited
in the United States Postal Service as first class
mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for
Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on 9-18-06 2006
STAAS & HALSEY
By Richard A. Gollhofer
Date 9-18-06